



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONFERENCE WITH GENERAL SAWYER

Following the conference with the President, the friends of education at his invitation spent two hours in conference with General Sawyer. General Sawyer is the private physician of the President, to whom has been entrusted the task of interpreting to the American people the mind of the President with reference to the proposed Department. General Sawyer made his statement and allowed questions and objections. A frank and full discussion followed in which the entire and united opposition of the educational agencies to the submerging of education within a department devoted chiefly to veteran relief, public health and social service as provided for in the bill, was set forth.

The statement just made that the opposition to the submerging of education is "entire and united" must be modified to this extent, that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy does not join the other agencies of education in this opposition. In an official communication issued by the National Catholic Welfare Council, the position of the Roman Catholic Church is definitely defined in the following words: "Should the McCormick bill be passed and the Department of Public Welfare be established, the Bureau of Education would simply be transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Public Welfare; it would not be erected into a separate department. In that case, the situation would practically be what it is at present."

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT J. H. MAC CRACKEN,

Chairman of the Committee on Federal Legislation of the American Council on Education before the Joint Committee, May 18, 1921.

The American Council on Education, which is an organization of National Educational Organizations, corresponding to the National Chamber of Commerce in the business world, has from the beginning definitely favored the creation of a Department of Education. In February 1917 we urged upon the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education either a favorable report on Senator Owen's bill then pending or the introduction of a new and more comprehensive bill creating a

Department. I submit herewith for the record a copy of the printed memorial presented to the Chairman of the Senate Committee at that time. After four years of discussion of the question from every angle, after submission of the question by written referendum with the arguments for and against, set out in order, the Council again on May 5 placed itself definitely on record as favoring the creation of a Department of Education. We do not oppose the creation of a Department of Public Welfare. It lies outside of our province as an organization to express any opinion on the administration and promotion of public health, social service and veteran relief. We ask, however, that Education be not included in the Department and that Congress be left free to vote on the question of a Department of Education on its merits. This is not a new question. It has been under consideration of Congress for five years, one might almost say for fifty-five years. At the close of the Civil War James A. Garfield secured the creation of a Department, but before it was hardly organized, the infant Department was degraded to the position of a bureau because of political exigencies which arose in connection with some question of caring for colored wards of the Government. We hope history will not repeat itself. A question is never settled until it is settled right.

The arguments against the inclusion of Education in the Department of Public Welfare are:

(1) It violates the fundamental principle of governmental organization laid down by Mr. Hoover in a recent speech and endorsed by all experienced administrators. "Administration units of government must be so grouped as to give to the great departments as nearly as possible a single purpose." Education has a perfectly definite, well defined task. It is a task performed by a distinct profession. While it contributes to and makes possible public health, social service and veteran relief, it is entirely independent of and has no organic connection with them.

(2) An examination of the budget of the proposed Department shows that of the total funds to be handled by the Department the allotment to Education would be one-half of one per cent. One-half of one per cent is prohibition, not pro-

motion. It is a policy of "spurlos versenkt" to submerge education in the billion ocean of veteran relief.

(3) Education is a primary interest of the American people. Unlike the tariff it is not a local question. California and Iowa, Texas and Oklahoma are if anything more enthusiastic for education than Massachusetts or Ohio. We Americans are free to make our government in our own image and for our own needs. A national government which does not give education a place in the councils of the nation on equal footing with commerce, labor and agriculture, does not accurately reflect the interests and ideals of the American people.

(4) The world war convinced the nation that while the states might each care for the education of their own people, this system left the United States as a nation without a proper representative or spokesman for American education in international relations. We are not convinced that the office and title of Assistant Secretary of Public Welfare, however patriotic and competent the volunteer might be, whom General Sawyer would secure, would carry sufficient dignity and weight to adequately represent American education in communication with the French Minister of Public Instruction and the Fine Arts, with Lord Fisher in London, the Minister of Public Education in Tokyo or even the Cultus Minister of vanquished Prussia.

(5) The office of Secretary of Education must above all else give us leadership in the world of ideas. Unless the world of education finds such leadership there, the office will fail of its purpose. The Department of Education must be in a peculiar sense, therefore, as was said of the University of Virginia, "the lengthened shadow of one man," and that man one who like the great democrat Thomas Jefferson would place on his tombstone along with the authorship of the Declaration of Independence and of a Virginia statute for religious freedom his service to education.

Public welfare we all want to promote. In Pennsylvania we have just organized a State Department of Public Welfare. The care of dependents, delinquents, deficient, of all socially handicapped, is necessary and a high duty. But the future of the nation does not lie there.

Two thousand years ago an attempt was made to divert proper honor and recognition from the great teacher by dragging across the trail the needs of the socially handicapped. As regards public welfare, we teachers answer now as he answered them, to test the sincerity of the movement, "the poor ye have with ye alway and when ye will ye may do them good."

STANDARDIZATION BY THE CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION

At the* conference of representatives of standardizing agencies held under the auspices of the American Council on Education at Washington, D. C., May 6 and 7, 1921, Dr. Kelly reported on the standardizing activities of Church Boards of Education. Extracts from his report are here given. In view of the fact that the conference requested the United States Bureau to publish at an early date the minimum requirements of all the standardizing agencies, national and sectional, that part of his report is omitted from this statement. Those desiring to see the complete statement of the minimum requirements are advised to apply to Dr. G. F. Zook, Expert in Higher Education of the U. S. Bureau of Education.

There are twenty National Protestant Boards of Education. They are more or less directly related to from 325 to 340 colleges and universities.

Of the twenty only five report work in the field of standardization. These five are the Methodist Episcopal Board, the Methodist Episcopal Board, South, the Presbyterian Board, the Presbyterian Board, South, and the Board of the United Brethren in Christ. The standards of the Presbyterian Board have been determined largely by the standards adopted by such organizations as the North Central Association, while in the same way the Methodists South have been greatly influenced by the standards of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States. At its annual meeting in 1920 the Presbyterian Education Association of the South adopted the standards of the Association of Colleges and Sec-

*NOTE—This conference was held under the auspices of the American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.